

Divergence based Robust Estimation of Tail Index with Exponential Regression Model

Abhik Ghosh

*Bayesian and Interdisciplinary Research unit
Indian Statistical Institute
203 B. T. Road, Kolkata 700 108, India*

Abstract

The extreme value theory is becoming very popular in several applied sciences including finance, economy, hydrology etc. In univariate extreme value theory, we model the data by a heavy-tailed distribution characterized by its tail index; there are three broad class of tails – Pareto type, Weibull type and Gumbel type. The simplest and common estimator of the tail index is the Hill estimator that works only for Pareto type tails and has high bias; it is also highly non-robust in presence of the outliers with respect to the model. There are some recent attempts that produces asymptotically unbiased or robust alternative to the hill estimator; however all the robust alternatives works for any one type of tails. This paper proposes a new general estimator of the tail index that is both robust and have less bias under all the three types of tails compared to the existing robust estimator. This essentially produce a robust generalization of the estimator proposed by Matthys and Beirlant (2003) under the same model approximation to a suitable exponential regression framework using the density power divergence. The asymptotic and robustness properties of the estimator are derived in the paper along with an extensive simulation study.

Keywords: Extreme Value Theory, Robust Methods, Exponential Regression Model, Density power divergence

1. Introduction

The recent exploration in scientific technology and modern instruments expanded the scope of research in all field of life and there arise the needs of suitable analytical techniques to ensure the quality of overloaded datasets in the laboratory. In case of several applied sciences including economics, finance, hydrology etc., any decision obtained from statistical modeling based on those datasets leads to new innovation in the respective fields in the price of a huge cost and hence the investment has to insured beforehand carefully as much as possible against their potential adverse effects. Therefore, the risk managements has become very important area of research in recent era and arguably the

Email address: abhianik@gmail.com (Abhik Ghosh)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

May 6, 2014

most difficult area of it is to model the very rare but dangerous events that produce a huge risk (loss) in practice known as the “worst-case risk”. These events are seen to arise in analyzing unusual big claims in any insurance, studying equity risk, predicting rare natural disasters etc. These problems can not be solved using the regular normal models; the statistical framework that helps to analyze such situations is the extreme value theory. The extreme value models generally have a thicker tail compared to the normal models and the probabilities of rare events are modeled by non-zero tail probabilities of such heavy-tailed distributions. For any univariate distributions, such tail behavior is characterized by its tail index that measure, in layman’s term, the thickness of the tail.

In terms of the statistical languages, let $X_1, \dots, X_n, \dots$ denote independent and identically distributed data on a stationary process like daily stock returns or some measure on a natural event etc. and we model these observations by a distribution function F having density f . Then, the probabilities of any extreme event can be found by estimating the quantity $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x) = P(X_i > x)$ for some large threshold x . In order to infer about the extreme events beyond the sample range, one assume that the distribution of sample maximum $X_{(n)} = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ (properly standardized) converges to a non-degenerate distribution indexed by a parameter γ (say) known as the tail index of the distribution F . More precisely, following Gnedenko (1943) one assumes the existence of two sequences of constants $\{a_n\} > 0$ and $\{b_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p \left(\frac{X_{(n)} - b_n}{a_n} \leq x \right) = H_\gamma(x), \quad (1)$$

for all continuity points x of the extreme value distribution $H_\gamma(x)$. Then the distribution F of the original sample is said to belong to the maximum domain of attraction (MAD) of H_γ and can be classified into three board classes:

1. Fréchet class of distributions with $\gamma > 0$: Pareto, Burr, Student’s t, loggamma etc., all having slowly decaying tail;
2. Gumbel class of distributions with $\gamma = 0$: Exponential, Weibull, normal, gamma, lognormal etc., all having exponentially fast decaying tail;
3. Weibull class of distributions with $\gamma < 0$: Uniform, reversed Burr, beta, reversed Pareto etc., all having finite right tail.

Estimation of the tail index γ for all the three classes is the main problem in the extreme value theory and, as one can expect, there are many literatures providing the same. In this regards, the simplest classical estimator of the tail weight is the Hill’s (1975) estimator defined by

$$\hat{\gamma}_H = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \log(X_{(n-i+1)}) - \log(X_{(n-k)}), \quad (2)$$

where $X_{(i)}$ denotes the i^{th} order statistics in $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. Although Hill’s estimator is very popular in extreme value theory, it only works under the Pareto type tails with $\gamma > 0$. Smith (1987) derives a maximum likelihood estimator of tail index using the generalized Pareto distribution for excess over a high threshold (POT) that have a non-degenerate asymptotic distribution only for $\gamma > -1/2$. On the other end, Hosking and Wallis (1987) derived estimators of the tail index that gives good results for $\gamma < 1$. The

estimation of all the three types of tail index was proposed by Pickands (1975) although that was latter seen to be unstable with respect to the choice of the sample proportion used (k/n) . The moment type estimator of the general $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, proposed by Dekkers et al. (1989), become popular due to its simple interpretation, although it have quite high asymptotic variance at negative γ . Recently Beirlant et al. (1999) and Matthya and Beirlant (2003) developed a maximum likelihood estimator of the tail index based on an exponential regression model approximation, that treats all the three types of tails at once and on equal basis; it has asymptotic variance lesser compared to Moment type estimator at $\gamma < 0$ and almost equal to POT estimator at $\gamma > 0$.

However, the above mentioned existing literatures do not take care into account the possible outlying observations present in the sample and most of those estimators, if not all, are highly sensitive to those outliers. However, in real practice, there could be a significant portion of outliers in collected datasets with respect to the assumed model, either due to ignorance of some external factor, or erroneous input at some level of data collection, and the inference about the tail events using those observations generates incorrect insights producing a big loss as mentioned earlier. Thus the automatic outlier detection with robust tools is very crucial to manage the quality of data and the overall inference. This part was completely ignored due to the prior conception that the two theory of extreme value statistics and robust statistics are contradictory as the first model the large observations in the sample and the second ignores them. That there could be two types of large observations in a sample and need to be handled separately to get more accurate results is noticed very recently and some attempts has been made to produce robust estimator of the tail index. These includes Vandewalle et al. (2004, 2007), Kim and Lee (2008); but these estimators are proposed and examined only for the Pareto type tails with $\gamma > 0$. Recently Goegebeur et al. (2014) derived a robust estimator of Weibull type tails having $\gamma < 0$ but using the coditional approach with some covariates. However, in practice the prior knowledge on the type of tail is not often available since it is difficult to understand only from the data before estimating the tail index γ . Therefore, a robust estimator considering all the three types of estimator at once [like the non-robust estimator of Matthya and Beirlant (2003)] would be really helpful to a wide range of practitioners in several applied fields including risk management, finance, hydrology and many others.

The present paper is targeted to generate one such estimator extending the concept of Matthya and Beirlant (2003); we will use the robust minimum density power divergence estimation techniques in place of the non-robust maximum likelihood. The minimum density power divergence estimator, proposed by Basu et al. (1998), becomes very popular robust alternative to the maximum likelihood estimators with a small loss of efficiency in advantage of high robustness properties with respect to outlying observations; further the estimation process is in fact no more complicated than the maximum likelihood estimation. The density power divergence down-weights the outliers by a non-zero power of model density and we will exploit this fact to derive a robust estimator of the tail index under the exponential regression model approximation to the log-ratio of ordered excess over a large threshold.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: We start with a brief description of the maximum likelihood estimator of γ under the exponential regression model (ERM) from Matthya and Beirlant (2003) in Section 2 to understand the model conditions and notations clearly. In Section 3 we will present the robust estimator of the tail

index by minimizing the density power divergence between data and the approximated exponential regression model; we will also proof their robustness for all the three types of tails. Then the performance of the proposed estimator will be illustrated through an extensive simulation study in Section 4. Section 5 will present some discussion on the source of bias and the choice of tuning parameters. Finally we end this paper with some remarks in Section 6.

2. Exponential Regression Model for Tail Index Estimation and Non-robust Maximum Likelihood

Let us consider a random sample $X_1, \dots, X_n$ from a distribution F that belongs to the maximum domain of attraction of the extreme value distribution H_γ . Therefore F satisfies the condition (1) that is reformulated by an equivalent condition in de Haan (1970), which assumes the existence of a measurable positive function $a_Q(\cdot)$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q(\lambda t) - Q(t)}{a_Q(t)} = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda^\gamma - 1}{\gamma} & \text{for } \gamma \neq 0, \\ \log \lambda & \text{for } \gamma = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where Q is the tail quantile function defined by $Q(t) = \inf \{x : F(x) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{t}\}$. This condition helps us to derive an useful nonparametric approximation to the ordered spacing of the observed sample as shown in Matthya and Beirlant (2003). Let $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$ denote the ordered sample; $U_{(1)} \leq U_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq U_{(n)}$ denote the order statistics from n i.i.d. uniform(0,1), $V_{(1)} \leq V_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq V_{(k)}$ and $E_{(1)} \leq E_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq E_{(k)}$ denote the same from k i.i.d. uniform(0,1) and exponential(1) random variabls respectively. Throughout this paper, we will write $W \stackrel{d}{=} Z$ to mean that W and Z have the same distribution and $W \stackrel{d}{\sim} Z$ to mean that they have the same asymptotic distribution.

Now for a fixed $k < n$ and any $j = 1, \dots, k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-k)} &\stackrel{d}{=} Q(U_{(j)}^{-1}) - Q(U_{(k+1)}^{-1}) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} Q(U_{(k+1)}^{-1} V_{(j)}^{-1}) - Q(U_{(k+1)}^{-1}) \\ &\sim^d a_Q(U_{(k+1)}^{-1}) \frac{V_{(j)}^{-\gamma} - 1}{\gamma}, \quad [\text{by condition 3}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-k)}}{X_{(n-j)} - X_{(n-k)}} \right) &\sim^d \log \left(\frac{V_{(j)}^{-\gamma} - 1}{V_{(j+1)}^{-\gamma} - 1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \log(e^{\gamma E_{(k-j+1)}} - 1) - \log(e^{\gamma E_{(k-j)}} - 1) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} (E_{(k-j+1)} - E_{(k-j)}) \frac{\gamma e^{\gamma E^*}}{e^{\gamma E^*} - 1} \\ &\quad [\text{by MVT; } E^* \text{ in between } E_{(k-j)} \text{ and } E_{(k-j+1)}] \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{E_{k-j+1}}{j} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{1 - (e^{-E^*})^\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where $E_1, \dots, E_k$ are k i.i.d. observations from an exponential distribution with mean 1 and (e^{-E^*}) belongs in between $V_{(k-j)}$ and $V_{(k-j+1)}$ so that it can be estimated by $\frac{j}{k+1}$. Hence, we get a exponential regression model approximation for the scaled log-ratios of ordered spacing given by

$$j \log \left(\frac{X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-k)}}{X_{(n-j)} - X_{(n-k)}} \right) \sim^d \frac{\gamma}{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^\gamma} E_{k-j+1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1. \quad (4)$$

Let us denote the left hand side of the above equation (4) by Y_j for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. Then, asymptotically the distribution of Y_j is the exponential with mean $\theta_j = \frac{\gamma}{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^\gamma}$ that can be used to estimate the tail index γ . One important advantage of the above construction is that the values of Y_j s remains invariant under location and scale transformation of the data and so will be the corresponding estimator of γ obtained using Y_j s; the estimator of tail index will also be independent of the measurement unit of the data.

Matthya and Beirlant (2003) proposed to estimate the tail index γ by maximizing the log-likelihood corresponding to the above exponential regression model given by

$$l(\gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\log \left(\frac{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^\gamma}{\gamma} \right) - Y_j \left(\frac{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^\gamma}{\gamma} \right) \right].$$

Differentiating above with respect to γ , the maximum likelihood estimator of γ , denoted by $\hat{\gamma}_{MLE}$, can be obtained as a solution of the estimating equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \left[Y_j - \frac{\gamma}{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^\gamma} \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{J}(u) = (u^\gamma - 1 - \gamma u^\gamma \log u) / \gamma^2$. The asymptotic distribution and consistency of $\hat{\gamma}_{MLE}$ are derived in Matthya and Beirlant (2003) under suitable assumptions. Further it is observed that, in terms of asymptotic variance, $\hat{\gamma}_{MLE}$ performs similar to the POT estimator at $\gamma > 0$ and significantly better compared to the moment type estimators at $\gamma < 0$; at $\gamma = 1$ all the three estimators has equal asymptotic variance 1. However, in spite of having asymptotic optimum properties, the crucial problem of any maximum likelihood estimator is the lack of robustness with respect to the outlying observation in the sample. So $\hat{\gamma}_{MLE}$ is also highly non-robust with respect to outliers and in this paper we will present a robust generalization of this estimator using the density power divergence.

3. Robust Estimation of the Tail Index under ERM by minimizing the Density Power Divergence

The density power divergence, proposed by Basu et al. (1998), becomes very popular now-a-days in the context of robust inference. It uses the philosophy of weighted likelihood estimating equation, where the outlying observations having low model probability

are down-weighted by a non-zero power α of the model density. Thus, the density power divergence is defined in terms of the tuning parameter α as follows:

$$d_\alpha(g, f_\theta) = \int f_\theta^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \int f_\theta^\alpha g + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int g^{1+\alpha}, \quad \text{if } \alpha > 0.$$

For $\alpha = 0$, the corresponding divergence can be defined as the continuous limit of the above divergence as $\alpha \downarrow 0$, which is nothing but the Kulback-Leibler divergence:

$$d_0(g, f_\theta) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} d_\alpha(g, f_\theta) = \int g \log(g/f_\theta).$$

For independent and identically distributed sample $X_1, \dots, X_n$ from a population to be modeled by a parametric family $\{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$, the minimum density power divergence estimator (MDPDE) of the parameter of interest θ has to be obtained by minimizing the divergence between the data and model density, or equivalently by minimizing the quantity

$$H_n(\theta) = \int f_\theta^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\theta^\alpha(X_i)$$

with respect to $\theta \in \Theta$. Under suitable assumptions, the MDPDE of θ can be seen to be consistent and asymptotically normal. Further, Basu et al. (1998) shown that the tuning parameter α controls the trade-off between asymptotic efficiency and robustness — at $\alpha = 0$ we have the most efficient but highly no-robust maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) and at $\alpha = 1$ it coincides with L_2 -divergence generating highly robust but inefficient estimator. They have also argued that the consideration of MDPDE with $\alpha > 1$ is unnecessary; in fact MDPDE with small positive α gives quite satisfactory robust results with a very little loss in efficiency.

Here we want to obtain the minimum density power divergence estimator of the tail index based on a observed sample $X_1, \dots, X_n$ from a population with distribution function F . However, we have not assumed any parametric model for the corresponding population and transform the data from $X_1, \dots, X_n$ to $Y_1, \dots, Y_{k-1}$ as defined in the previous section with k being the number of extreme observations to be used. Then, we have seen that, with only the assumptions of $F \in MAD(H_\gamma)$, we can approximate the distribution of the transformed observations Y_j s by a suitable exponential regression model. Note that the transformed samples Y_j are no-longer identically distributed, although they are still independent. Thus, we can not directly apply the original formulation of the MDPDE as described above; we need a suitable generalization for the non-homogeneous data. Ghosh and Basu (2013) provides one such generalization by minimizing the average density power divergence measures computed separately for all the sample points. In this paper, we will follow the approach of Ghosh and Basu (2013) to produce a robust estimator of the tail index.

3.1. Estimating Equation

Consider the set-up of Section 2 with a random sample $X_1, \dots, X_n$ from the distribution F and $F \in MAD(H_\gamma)$. Define $Y_j = j \log \left(\frac{X_{(n-j+1)} - X_{(n-k)}}{X_{(n-j)} - X_{(n-k)}} \right)$; let its true distribution and density functions are G_j and g_j respectively (obtained from F). As argued in previous section, we will model this by an exponential regression model (4) so that Y_j s

independently follows f_{θ_j} , where f_{θ} is the exponential density with mean θ . Note that θ_j is a non-linear function of the parameter of interest γ . Then following Ghosh and Basu (2013), the minimum density power divergence estimator of γ has to be obtained by minimizing the average discrepancy

$$H_k(\gamma) = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\int f_{\theta_j}^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \int f_{\theta_j}^{\alpha} \hat{g}_j \right], \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{g}_j$ is some non-parametric estimator of g_j based on the observed sample. Note that, here the size of the transformed sample is $k-1$; we will assume that as the original sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, k also tends to infinity. Further, for each j we have only one observation Y_j from g_j and so the best possible non-parametric estimator of g_j considering the independence between Y_j s is given by the degenerate distribution at Y_j . Then, using the form of exponential density, the above objective function can be seen to have the form:

$$H_k(\gamma) = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\frac{1}{(1+\alpha)\theta_j^{\alpha}} - \frac{(1+\alpha)}{\alpha\theta_j^{\alpha}} e^{-\frac{\alpha Y_j}{\theta_j}} \right], \quad (7)$$

Alternatively, we can also obtain the MDPDE of the tail index γ by solving the estimating equation $\nabla_{\gamma} H_k(\gamma) = 0$, where ∇_{γ} represents the first order partial derivatives with respect to γ . A routine differentiation of (7) yields the following simplified form of the estimating equation:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J}_{\alpha} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \left[\frac{\alpha\theta_j}{(1+\alpha)^2} + (Y_j - \theta_j) e^{-\frac{\alpha Y_j}{\theta_j}} \right] = 0, \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{J}_{\alpha}(u) = (u^{\gamma} - 1 - \gamma u^{\gamma} \log u)(1 - u^{\gamma})^{\alpha} \gamma^{-\alpha-2}$; or equivalently in terms of γ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J}_{\alpha} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \left[\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^2} \frac{\gamma}{\left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^{\gamma} \right\}} + \left(Y_j - \frac{\gamma}{1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^{\gamma}} \right) e^{-\frac{\alpha Y_j \left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^{\gamma} \right\}}{\gamma}} \right] = 0. \quad (9)$$

Whenever the above estimating equation has more than one root, we choose the one that minimizes the objective function $H_k(\gamma)$. We will denote the corresponding minimum density power divergence estimator of the tail index γ by $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$, where k and α are the tuning parameters used. Interestingly, note that the above MDPDE estimating equation (9) coincides with the maximum likelihood estimating equation (5) at $\alpha = 0$ and hence $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(0)}$ is nothing but the estimator proposed in Matthya and Beirlant (2003), denoted by “MB estimator” throughout this paper. Since the case $\alpha = 0$ provides no outlier down-weighting, the corresponding estimator is clearly non-robust; the minimum density power divergence estimators with $\alpha > 0$ provides its robust generalization. In the next subsection, we will rigorously examine their robustness through the classical influence function analysis.

3.2. Robustness: Influence Function Analysis

The most common and classical tool for measuring robustness is Hampel's (1968, 1974) influence function analysis. It indeed gives us the first order approximation to the asymptotic bias of the estimator under infinitesimal contamination at an outlier point in the sample space; so whenever the influence function of an estimator is bounded its bias can not increase indefinitely even if there is a strong contamination in a point far away from the central cloud of the model distribution. The supremum of the influence function over all possible outliers point yields a measure of the extend of robustness of the estimators with lower being the better. We will now derive the influence function of the proposed DPD based estimator of tail index under the exponential regression model approximation.

In order to obtain the influence function, we need to re-define the estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ in terms of a statistical functional. For simplicity, we will work with the transformed variables Y_j , $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ and let $\mathbf{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_{k-1})$. Following Equation (6), it can be seen that $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)} = T_\alpha(\hat{\mathbf{G}})$ where $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ denotes the distribution function of $\hat{g}_j$ and the functional $T_\alpha(\mathbf{G})$ is defined as the minimizer of

$$\frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\int f_{\theta_j}^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \int f_{\theta_j}^\alpha g_j \right] = \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left[\frac{1}{(1+\alpha)\theta_j^\alpha} - \frac{(1+\alpha)}{\alpha\theta_j^\alpha} \int e^{-\frac{\alpha y}{\theta_j}} g_j(y) dy \right],$$

with respect to γ . Note that the statistical functional corresponding to the estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ in this case depends on the parameter k as the case of Ghosh and Basu (2013) for non-homogeneous observations. Therefore, the corresponding influence function will also depend on k , the number of extreme sample to be used in estimation; so we will refer it as the fixed-sample influence function. Let $\gamma^g = T_\alpha(\mathbf{G})$ be the true best fitting parameter value. Then, by using the divergence property of the DPD, one can show that the statistical functional T_α is Fisher consistent. Note that the functional $T_\alpha(\mathbf{G})$ satisfies the estimating equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \left[\frac{\alpha\theta_j}{(1+\alpha)^2} + \int (y - \theta_j) e^{-\frac{\alpha y}{\theta_j}} g_j(y) dy \right] = 0. \quad (10)$$

Now let us consider the contamination over the true distributions. Note that any contamination in our original sample X_i s with true distribution F induces some amount of contamination in the transformed variables Y_j s having the true distribution G_j ; since Y_j s are not identically distributed, we have to consider the contamination in each Y_j separately as done in Ghosh and Basu (2013). Also, the induced contamination may affect all the Y_j s or some of them. Let us first consider the simplest case where there is contamination on only one Y_j , say at j_0^{th} observation for some $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. Then we consider the corresponding contaminated distribution $G_{j_0,\epsilon} = (1-\epsilon)G_{j_0} + \epsilon\Delta_{t_0}$, where ϵ is the contamination proportion and Δ_{t_0} denotes the degenerate distribution at the contamination point t_0 . Define $\gamma_{\epsilon,j_0} = T_\alpha(G_1, \dots, G_{j_0,\epsilon}, \dots, G_{k-1})$ which should satisfies the estimating equation (10) with G_{j_0} replaced by $G_{j_0,\epsilon}$. Differentiating the resulting equation with respect to ϵ at $\epsilon = 0$, or using the results of Ghosh and Basu (2013), we get the fixed-sample influence function of T_α based on k extremes at the true

distribution $\underline{\mathbf{G}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} IF_{k,j_0}(t_0; T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{G}}) &= \left. \frac{\partial \gamma_{\epsilon, j_0}}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \frac{\Psi_n^{-1}}{k-1} \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{j_0}{k+1} \right) \left[(t_0 - \theta_{j_0}) e^{-\frac{\alpha t_0}{\theta_{j_0}}} - \int (y - \theta_{j_0}) e^{-\frac{\alpha y}{\theta_{j_0}}} g_{j_0}(y) dy \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with $\gamma = \gamma^g$ and Ψ_n is defined according to Equations (3.3) and (3.5) of Ghosh and Basu (2013). We will simplify this expression for a particular case where the exponential regression model approximation (4) holds well enough so that we can replace G_j by corresponding exponential distributions F_{θ_j} with $\gamma^g = \gamma$ in above. Denote $\underline{\mathbf{F}} = (F_{\theta_1}, \dots, F_{\theta_{k-1}})$. Then, the fixed-sample influence function of the MDPDE of γ at the model becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &IF_{k,j_0}(t_0; T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}}) \\ &= \frac{(1+\alpha)^3}{(1+\alpha^2)} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\theta_j^{\alpha-2}} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^2 \right]^{-1} \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{j_0}{k+1} \right) \left[(t_0 - \theta_{j_0}) e^{-\frac{\alpha t_0}{\theta_{j_0}}} + \frac{\alpha \theta_{j_0}}{(1+\alpha)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear from the form of the above influence function and the boundedness of the function se^{-s} that the fixed-sample influence function of the DPD based estimator T_α will be bounded over the contamination point $t_0 > 0$ at any k provided $\alpha > 0$. Thus, all the MDPDE of the tail index γ with $\alpha > 0$ will be robust with respect to outliers at any particular Y_j s for any choice of k . However, at $\alpha = 0$ the influence function of the corresponding MDPDE, which is the same as the MB estimator, is given by

$$IF_{k,j_0}(t_0; T_0, \underline{\mathbf{F}}) = \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^2 \theta_j^2 \right]^{-1} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j_0}{k+1} \right) (t_0 - \theta_{j_0}), \quad (12)$$

which is a straight line with respect to t_0 and hence unbounded; this clearly proves the non-robust nature of the existing MB estimator even under contamination in one transformed variable.

Figure 1 shows the fixed sample influence function under the model for different types of tails with $k = 100$ and different values of contamination direction j_0 . The boundedness of the MDPDEs with $\alpha > 0$ are clear from the figures. However, the influence functions becomes more flatter as the contamination direction j_0 increases. Interestingly, note also that the influence functions at positive γ (Pareto-Type tail) and negative γ (Weibull-Type tail) are almost symmetrically opposite in nature to each other with respect to the value 0 and the Gumbel-Type tails with $\gamma = 0$ has an influence function lying in between the above two.

Next consider the more general case of contamination in all the Y_j s and define the corresponding MDPDE of γ as $\gamma_\epsilon = T_\alpha(G_{1,\epsilon}, \dots, G_{j_0,\epsilon}, \dots, G_{k-1,\epsilon})$, where $G_{j,\epsilon} = (1 - \epsilon)G_j + \epsilon \wedge_{t_j}$ for all j . The contamination points in this case are $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1})$. Then, in this case also we can derive the fixed-sample influence function of T_α at the true distribution proceeding as before; under the assumption (4) it has the simplified form given by

$$\begin{aligned}
IF_k(\mathbf{t}; T_\alpha, \mathbf{F}) &= \left. \frac{\partial \gamma_\epsilon}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon=0} \\
&= \frac{(1+\alpha)^3}{(1+\alpha^2)} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\theta_j^{\alpha-2}} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^2 \right]^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \left[(t_j - \theta_j) e^{-\frac{\alpha t_j}{\theta_j}} + \frac{\alpha \theta_j}{(1+\alpha)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, here also, the influence function of T_α is bounded for all $\alpha > 0$ with any choice of k ; but it is unbounded at $\alpha = 0$. This again shows the robustness of the proposed MDPDE of tail index at contamination in all Y_j s over the existing non-robust MB estimator.




Figure 1: Fixed-sample Influence Function of T_α over the contamination point for different types of tails with $k = 100$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].

Next, in order to examine the effect of k and $\alpha > 0$ on the extend of robustness, we consider the measure “*Gross-Error Sensitivity* of Hampel (1968) defined as

$$s(T_\alpha, \mathbf{G}) = \sup_t \{ ||IF(t, T_\alpha, \mathbf{F})|| \}. \quad (13)$$

As the influence function gives us the indication of asymptotic bias under contamination, this measure will reflect the maximum possible values of the bias that an estimator can have under infinitesimal contamination. So, lower the values of $s(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{G}})$ larger the stability of the estimator T_α with respect to contamination implying more robustness. In case of the proposed MDPDE of γ , we can derive the form of the gross-error sensitivity under contamination in only Y_{j_0} as

$$s_{j_0}(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}}) = \sup_{t_0} \{ \|IF_{k,j_0}(t_0; T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}})\|^2 \}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \frac{(1+\alpha)^2(e^{-(1+\alpha)} + \alpha^2)}{(1+\alpha^2)\alpha} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\theta_j^{\alpha-2}} \tilde{J}\left(\frac{j}{k+1}\right)^2 \right]^{-1} \tilde{J}\left(\frac{j_0}{k+1}\right) \frac{1}{\theta_{j_0}^{\alpha-1}} & \text{if } \alpha > 0, \\ \infty & \text{if } \alpha = 0. \end{cases}$$

Figure 2 shows the values of this sensitivity measure $s_{j_0}(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}})$ over the tuning parameters k and α for different types of tails with contamination direction $j_0 = k/2$ and $j_0 = k/5$. Clearly the sensitivity measure $s_{j_0}(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}})$ decreases as both the tuning parameter α and the number k of extreme observation to be used increases; it is in fact tends to infinity as $\alpha, k \rightarrow 0$. Further, the rate of change in the values of $s_{j_0}(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}})$ with respect to k is more in case of positive γ (Pareto-Type tail) compared to the case of negative γ (Weibull-type tail) and the case with $\gamma = 0$ (Gumbel type tail) has values in between them. On the other hand, the dependence of the sensitivity measure on α is more strict for the Weibull-Type tails compared to the Pareto-type tails. However, in all the cases, the choice $\alpha \geq 0.3$ and $k \geq 100$ gives quite small values of $s_{j_0}(T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{F}})$ implying strong robustness properties of the corresponding MDPDEs. With respect to the contamination direction j_0 , there is not much of a difference in the nature of sensitivity over the tuning parameter α and k ; only its value increases slightly with j_0 . The sensitivity for contamination in more than one or in all the observations can be obtained similarly; it is seen to have exactly the same behavior as the case of contamination in one direction and hence those details are not presented here for brevity.

Finally note that the above fixed sample influence function and the sensitivity measure depends on the sample size n through the parameter k because in usual practice, we assume $k = \alpha n$ for some small fraction α . Thus, it would be interesting for a practitioner working with large data set to know the similar robustness properties of the proposed estimators for infinitely large samples sizes, i.e., as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The asymptotic influence function obtained by taking limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the above fixed sample influence function provides us such asymptotic robustness analysis; note that $k \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by usual assumptions. Also for any fixed j_0 ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{j-0} = \begin{cases} \gamma, & \text{if } \gamma > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \gamma \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{J}\left(\frac{j_0}{k+1}\right) = \begin{cases} \gamma, & \text{if } \gamma > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \gamma \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Using these, one can derive the asymptotic influence function under contamination in only one fixed direction as given by

$$IF_{j_0}(t_0; T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{G}}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} IF_{k,j_0}(t_0; T_\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{G}}) = 0. \quad (14)$$




Figure 2: Gross-error sensitivity $s_{j_0}(T_{\alpha}, \mathbf{F})$ over the tuning parameters k and α for different types of tails with contamination direction $j_0 = k/2$ and $j_0 = k/5$.

Thus all the MDPDEs including the maximum likelihood (MB) estimator ($\alpha = 0$) will be unaffected under contamination in only one fixed observations whenever we have a large enough sample size; this is in-line with our intuition. However, the most interesting case is the contamination in all the observations under the large sample; we will assume that the contaminations points also go to infinity with the sample size, i.e., assume $t_j = \psi(t, j/(k+1))$ with ψ being an positive unbounded function of t . Then the asymptotic influence function can be seen to have the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 IF(t_0; T_{\alpha}, \mathbf{G}) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} IF_k(t_0; T_{\alpha}, \mathbf{G}) \\
 &= \frac{(1+\alpha)^3 \int_0^1 \tilde{J}(u) \left[\left(\psi(t, u) - \frac{\gamma}{1-u^\gamma} \right) e^{-\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \psi(t, u)(1-u^\gamma)} + \frac{\alpha\gamma}{(1+\alpha)(1-u^\gamma)} \right] du}{(1+\alpha^2) \gamma^{\alpha+2} \int_0^1 \tilde{J}(u)^2 (1-u^\gamma)^{\alpha-2} du}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that, the above asymptotic influence function at $\alpha = 0$ depends on the outlier parameter t by the linear function of $\int_0^1 \psi(t, u) du$, which is unbounded in t as the positive integral is so. However, the same for $\alpha > 0$ depends on t through an exponential function of $[-\int_0^1 \psi(t, u) du]$ and hence bounded implying the robustness of the MDPDE even under large samples.

3.3. Asymptotic Properties

Now let us consider the asymptotic distribution of the proposed MDPDE. Note that we have proposed the MDPDE under the set-up of independent but non-homogeneous observations Y_j following the idea of Ghosh and Basu (2013); in that paper they have

also provided the asymptotic properties of the MDPDE under the same set-up with some suitable assumptions. Thus, in order to obtain the asymptotic properties of the MDPDE of tail index under exponential regression model it is enough to verify those conditions (assumptions (A1)–(A7) of their paper) under the true distribution of the transformed variables Y_j . Note that, in this case our j^{th} model density is the exponential density with mean θ_j . For simplicity, let us first assume that the true distribution G_j of Y_j belongs to the model family; this is in fact true under the condition (4). Under this condition, the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimator are presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Consider the above mentioned set-up for the estimation of the tail index and assume that the exponential regression approximation (4) holds uniformly over the support of Y_j s with $k \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists a consistent sequence $\gamma_{k,n}^{(\alpha)}$ of roots of the minimum density power divergence estimating equation (9) with tuning parameter α . Further, the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{k-1} \left(\gamma_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} - \gamma \right)$ is normal with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_\gamma^2/a_\gamma^2$, provided this asymptotic variance exists. Here, we have defined, for $\gamma \neq 0$*

$$a_\gamma = \frac{(1+\alpha^2)}{(1+\alpha)^3\gamma^{\alpha+2}} \int_0^1 (1-u^\gamma - \gamma u^\gamma \log u)^2 (1-u^\gamma)^{\alpha-2} du,$$

$$\sigma_\gamma^2 = \left[\frac{(1+4\alpha^2)}{(1+2\alpha)^3} - \frac{\alpha^2}{(1+\alpha)^4} \right] \frac{1}{\gamma^{2\alpha+2}} \int_0^1 (1-u^\gamma - \gamma u^\gamma \log u)^2 (1-u^\gamma)^{2\alpha-2} du.$$

and for $\gamma = 0$,

$$a_0 = \frac{(1+\alpha^2)}{4(1+\alpha)^3} \int_0^1 (-\log u)^{\alpha+2} du, \quad \sigma_0^2 = \left[\frac{(1+4\alpha^2)}{(1+2\alpha)^3} - \frac{\alpha^2}{(1+\alpha)^4} \right] \frac{1}{4} \int_0^1 (1-\log u)^{2\alpha+2} du.$$

Proof: Since the exponential regression approximation (4) holds true uniformly over the support of Y_j s, asymptotically we can work with the independent variables W_j , $j = 1, \dots, k-1$, where each W_j follows an exponential distribution with mean θ_j and the required asymptotic distribution of the tail index estimator will be the same as the distribution of the minimum DPD estimator of γ under this set-up. Now, a simple but lengthy calculation (as presented in Appendix A) shows that the conditions (A1)–(A7) of Ghosh and Basu (2013) hold for this particular exponential regression model. Then, a direct application of the Theorem 3.1 of Ghosh and Basu (2013) proves the existence of a consistence sequence of estimators $\gamma_{k,n}^{(\alpha)}$ with

$$\Omega_k^{-1/2} \Psi_k \sqrt{k-1} (\gamma_{k,n}^{(\alpha)} - \gamma) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1),$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (or $n \rightarrow \infty$), where

$$\Omega_k = \left[\frac{(1+4\alpha^2)}{(1+2\alpha)^3} - \frac{\alpha^2}{(1+\alpha)^4} \right] \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right)^2 \theta_j^2,$$

and

$$\Psi_k = \frac{(1+\alpha^2)}{(1+\alpha)^3} \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{j}{k+1} \right) \theta_j^{\alpha-2},$$

Thus the theorem follows by noting the fact that $\Omega_k \rightarrow \sigma_\gamma^2$ and $\Psi_k \rightarrow a_\gamma$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Note that, as proved in above theorem the proposed estimator is asymptotically unbiased; we can also compute its asymptotic variance by a simple numerical integration which increases slightly as α increases.. However, it is worthwhile to note here that we have proved the above theorem under a very strong condition that may not hold for many parametric models. Further, in the next section we will explore the performance of the proposed estimator using simulation, where we will see that the estimator is not in fact unbiased for a fixed sample size, although the bias is very small compared to the existing proposals in many cases. The reason behind this phenomenon lies in the violation of the assumption (4). Thus it is of great importance to derive the asymptotic distribution of the proposed estimator under more general set-up. However, this would includes various complicated assumptions regarding the second order properties of the underlying distribution etc. (for example, see Matthya and Beirlant, 2003). We are skipping those technical complications for the time being and hope to pursue that in our subsequent research work. In this work we will demonstrate the performance of the proposed estimator through extensive simulation exercises presented in the next section. However, we will also present some indications on the source of bias and the effect of tuning parameters (α and k) on this bias in Section 5.

4. Numerical illustrations

4.1. Models considered and Set-Up

We will now study the performance of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ through an extensive simulation study. We consider several class of distributions having different types of tails following the work of Matthya and Beirlant (2003). Specifically, we consider three model having positive tail index, two having zero tail index and two having negative tail index as described below:

- (M1) Student's t-distribution with degrees of freedom ν having positive tail index given by $\gamma = 1/\nu$.
- (M2) Burr(β, τ, λ) distribution defined by the survival function $\bar{F}(x) = \left(1 + \frac{x^\tau}{\beta}\right)^{-\lambda}$. It also has a positive tail index given by $\gamma = 1/\tau\lambda$.
- (M3) Fréchet(γ) distribution with tail index $\gamma > 0$ and the distribution function given by $F(x) = \exp(-x^{-1/\gamma})$.
- (M4) Standard log-normal distribution having tail index $\gamma = 0$.
- (M5) Weibull(λ, τ) distribution defined by the survival function $\bar{F}(x) = \exp(-\lambda x^\tau)$. It also has zero tail index. In our simulation, we will consider $\lambda = 1$ and $\tau = 2$.
- (M6) Uniform(0, 1) distribution having right end-point 1 and negative tail index $\gamma = -1$.
- (M7) Reversed Burr(β, τ, λ) distribution defined by the survival function $\bar{F}(x) = \left(1 + \frac{(x_+ - x)^\tau}{\beta}\right)^{-\lambda}$. It has a finite right end-point x_+ and negative tail index given by $\gamma = -1/\tau\lambda$. We will take $x_+ = 2$ in our simulation.

Using these models and their combinations, we will create several interesting scenarios with and without contamination and test the proposed estimator in terms of both –

its bias and MSE. For this purpose, we simulate samples of size $n = 500$ under each scenario and estimate the tail index using that sample. Based on 100 replications of such samples, we compute the empirical estimate of the bias and MSE of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ and compare them over different values of α ; note that the case $\alpha = 0$ gives the MB estimator which is expected to be non-robust but has smaller bias under pure data. Below we present the description of some interesting scenarios only with the findings.

As we have noted earlier that there are a few robust estimator of tail index available in the literature only for the Pareto type tail with $\gamma > 0$. So, we can only compare the proposed estimators for the cases $\gamma \leq 0$ with the existing non-robust estimators and for this purpose we have considered the ML type estimator under the same set-up, namely the MB estimator. For the the cases with $\gamma > 0$ also, we have considered the non-robust MB and Hill estimators as a point of reference for studying the performance of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$. However, in this case, we have also compared our estimator with the existing robust methods; note that the recent robust estimator of the Pareto type tail under similar set-up includes the work of Vandewalle et al. (2004, 2007), Kim and Lee (2008). Among these proposals, the estimator of Kim and Lee (2008), denoted by $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ say, is obtained by minimizing the DPD with tuning parameter α under the assumption of exponentiality of log-relative excess and includes the proposal of Vandewalle et al. (2007) as its special case at $\alpha = 1$. Clearly this approach is closely related to our proposal and so we will make a comparison between these two approached for estimating the Pareto type tails. The proposal given by Vandewalle et al. (2004) uses a robust regression method (Marazzi and Yohai, 2004) under the assumption of a similar exponential regression model as considered in the present work; however we do not consider this proposal here due to the complications of deepest regression method and some more doubts on their proposal, as noted in Appendix B.

4.2. Performance of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ under pure models

Let us first check the performance of the proposed estimator under the pure model with no contamination. We have performed the simulation study as described above for all the models (M1)–(M7) and the empirical values of absolute bias and MSE of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ are presented in Figures 3 to 9 respectively. For the first three models having positive γ , the same summary measures are also plotted for the estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ proposed by Kim and Lee (2008).




Figure 3: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M1) having $\nu = 2$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 4: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M2) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 5: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M3) having $\gamma = 0.5$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 6: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M4) having $\gamma = 0$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].

Note that, when the data comes from the pure t-distribution (model M1, Figure 3), then the Hill's estimator has the minimum possible MSE for lower values of k but with relatively high bias. The MB estimators with moderately large k gives significantly less value of bias with a competitive values of MSE as expected. The estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α performs similarly to the Hill's estimator with slightly more bias and MSE. Our proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α also behaves similar to the MB- estimator with a slightly greater MSE but less bias at larger values of k ; thus the proposed estimators gives significant improvement over the robust estimators of Kim and Lee (2008) with respect to bias and competitive MSE values even under when there is no contamination. Similar advantages of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ is also observed when the data come from a Burr distribution with $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ so that $\gamma = 1$ (model M2,

Figure 4) or Fréchet distribution with $\gamma = 0.5$ (model M3, Figure 5). However in case of Burr distribution the improvement in bias is very high for all $\alpha \geq 0$ including the MB estimator.

Next, we consider the cases when data comes from a standard log-normal or Weibull distribution having tails of the Gumbel type ($\gamma = 0$). In these cases the performance of the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ gives quite good results at a lower value of k and its bias and MSE increases as α increases. For the log-normal case (model M4, Figure 6) both bias and MSE stabilizes beyond that optimum value of k and the gap with respect to α decreases. However, for the Weibull case (model M5, Figure 7) the bias increases with k and the same for a positive α becomes lesser than that of the MB estimator ($\alpha = 0$).




Figure 7: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 8: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 9: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M7) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ with no contamination [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].

Finally for the distributions having Weibull type tails, namely Uniform and Reversed Burr distributions, the performance of the MB estimator is the best both in terms of bias and MSE, but the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ also gives competitive values for small positive α . For uniform case their performances stabilizes with respect to k beyond a moderately large optimum value near $k = 150$. For reverse Burr distribution, both bias and MSE increases with k beyond $k = 50$; in that range the estimators with larger positive α outperform the MB estimator ($\alpha = 0$) but still have slightly higher value of bias and MSE compared to the MB estimator at very small k .

4.3. Performance of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ under contamination by same distribution with different tail index

Now let us consider the cases with contaminated data; however, in this subsection we will restrict our attention to the cases where the contamination is from the same distributions but with a different parameters (and so different values of tail index). Such situation arises in many cases when some part of the sample is recorded, by mistake, in a different measurement unit or by some different methods. For the scenarios considered here,, we will consider both light and heavy contamination proportions, 5% and 15%, to illustrate the robustness of the proposed estimator in both the cases.

First let us consider the samples from t-distribution with $\nu = 2$ (so that its tail index is $\gamma = 0.5$) but a certain percentage of the samples comes from t-distribution with $\nu = 1/3$ (tail index $\gamma = 3$). The estimated bias and MSE for the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for 5% and 15% contaminations are shown in Figures 10a and 10b respectively. As expected the robust estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α perform much better than the Hills estimator. Similarly, our proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ also performs better than the MB estimators in both the cases. Further, our proposed estimators also generates lower bias and MSE compared to the existing robust estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ when we consider a suitably large value of k .

Next we consider a similar set-up with Fréchet distribution, where we have again taken the tail index of the original sample to be $\gamma = 0.5$ and that of the contaminated part to be $\gamma = 3$. The results are shown in Figures Figures 11a and 11b for the two contamination proportions 5% and 15% respectively. Once again the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α performs better than the MB estimator at all k and better than the existing robust estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ at large values of k .

However, when we consider the similar scenario with Burr distribution (Figures 12a and 12b), although our proposed estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α perform much better than the MB estimator, it can not produce bias and variance compared to the robust estimators of Kim and Lee (2008). However, the bias and MSE of the proposed estimators in this case are quite competitive to that of the $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for both light and heavy contaminations.

4.4. Performance of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ under contaminations by different distribution but having same tail type

Let us now consider a more general case where the contaminated observations comes from a different distribution having the same tail type as original distribution. Again we

consider the samples from a t-distribution with $\nu = 2$ ($\gamma = 0.5$), but now we contaminate certain percentage of the sample by observations from a Fréchet distribution with $\gamma = 3$. The resulting bias and MSE are shown in Figures 13a and 13b for 5% and 15% contaminations respectively. Once again the proposed $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α performs much better compared to the non-robust Hill estimator and the MB estimator under both types of contaminations and also performs competitive to the robust estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$. Similar advantages of the proposed estimator is also observed when we reverse the two distributions, i.e., consider the samples from Fréchet distribution with $\gamma = 0.5$ with contamination from t-distribution with $\nu = 1/3$ ($\gamma = 3$); the results are not presented here for brevity.

Next we will consider an interesting situation using two distributions from the Gumbel class. Suppose our sample comes from a standard log-normal distribution and 5% or 15% of the sample is contaminated from the Weibull distribution. Note that both the distribution has zero tail index and so this scenario helps us to examine if there is any effect of the structure of distribution other than the value of tail index (like any second order parameter) on the proposed estimators. The empirical bias and MSE are shown in Figures 14a and 14b; it is clear that at the large values of k the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ have equal MSE to the existing MB estimator, but have improved bias for larger α close to one.

4.5. Performance of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ under contaminations by different distribution having different tail type

Finally we consider the most complicated cases of contamination where the contaminated observations come from a distribution not only having a different value of tail index but also of different tail type. In our simulation study, we will consider several interesting such cases by combination of different models from (M1) to (M7) and compute the empirical bias and MSE for each cases with 5% and 15% contaminations. For Brevity, we will only report the results of the following cases:

- (i) Sample from the model (M4) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination from the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ (Figures 15a and 15b).
- (ii) Sample from the model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination from the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ (Figures 16a and 16b).
- (iii) Sample from the model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination from the model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ (Figures 17a and 17b).
- (iv) Sample from the model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ with contamination from the model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ (Figures 18a and 18b).
- (v) Sample from the model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ with contamination from the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ (Figures 19a and 19b).
- (vi) Sample from the model (M7) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ so that $\gamma = -1$ with contamination from the model (M2) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (4, 0.25, 1)$, i.e., $\gamma = 1$. (Figures 20a and 20b).

From all the above figures, it is clear that the proposed estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α provide improvement in terms of both bias and MSE compared to the existing non-robust MB estimators; only the extend of difference differs from case to case. In the case

(iii) only, the bias and MSE of these estimators increases with k beyond a small value near $k = 50$; the rate of increase is more for bias compared to the MSE. Further, in this case (iii) the proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α gives competitive MSE to the MB estimator, although it still provides improvement in its bias. However, in all other the cases the bias and MSE both decreases with the values of k , but for all $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with α positive, this decay in bias and MSE becomes flatter beyond a moderately large value of k . In most of these cases, our proposed estimator gives a huge improvement in terms of robustness compared to the existing MB estimators.

5. On the choice of tuning parameters k and α

We have seen in the previous section that the proposed estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ performance much better under contamination than the existing estimators for most cases of Gumbel or Weibull type tails; for Pareto types tails also these estimators provide more robustness compared to the existing robust estimators of Kim and Lee (2008) in some case and otherwise generates competitive bias and MSE to those estimators. However, in all the cases, the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ differ significantly for different values of the tuning parameters α and k and we need to choose these parameters carefully in order to obtain the optimum performance both in terms of robustness and efficiency. Based on the findings of previous sections, we note the followings in respect to the dependence of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ on α and k :

1. When there is no contamination in data, the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ have least MSE at $\alpha = 0$ for any fixed k (it is in fact the MB estimators); MSE increases slightly as α increases.
2. Under the pure model, if we choose a large enough k then the difference in the performances of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with respect to different values of small positive α becomes very small.
3. For the contaminated samples, the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α perform much better than the case $\alpha = 0$ (MB estimator); however, their performance is mostly similar for all $\alpha \geq 0.3$.
4. When there is contamination in data with a Pareto type tail, our proposed estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with positive α performs slightly better or at competitive level with the robust estimators of Kim and Lee (2008). However, the estimators of Kim and Lee generate optimum bias and MSE at a smaller value of k , whereas our proposed estimators give minimum bias and MSE at a larger value of k for any fixed $\alpha > 0$.
5. For most of the cases with contaminated samples from Gumbel or Weibull type tails also, the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ with any fixed $\alpha > 0$ generate optimum bias and MSE at a large value of k .
6. For all the three types of tails, the bias and MSE of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ at any fixed $\alpha > 0$ decreases as k increases; however, beyond a moderately large value near $k = 200$ or $k = 250$ the rate of change becomes quite small.

Therefore, it is clear from the above observations on the simulation results that the tuning parameter α controls a trade-off between efficiency and robustness of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ of tail index. Similar nature of the tuning parameter α is also observed in

other minimum divergence estimators also; see, e.g., Base et al. (1998) and Ghosh and Basu (2013). Thus, our empirical suggestion for the choice of α in any practical case is $\alpha = 0.3$ as it gives only a slight loss in efficiency with much better performance under contamination. A larger value of α beyond 0.3 provide greater loss in efficiency without a significant improvement over the case $\alpha = 0.3$.

On the other hand the parameter k affects mainly the bias of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ and as k increases both bias and MSE decreases. This effect of k on the performance of $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ possibly comes from the violation of our main assumption (4) at smaller values of k ; as k increases the assumption of exponential regression model gives a better approximation to the model. Further, beyond $k = 200$ to 250 , these model approximation is good enough so that there is not much of a improvement in bias (and MSE) of the estimators as seen in the simulation study. Therefore, we suggest based on our empirical findings that k in between 200 to 250 is a reasonable choice while applying the proposed methodology for any practical situation.

It is worthwhile to note here that the bias of the proposed estimators, although smaller compared to the existing methods in most of the cases, comes mainly from the violation of the exponential model assumption (4) through the choice of k , as discussed above. So, there is a scope of improvement in bias of the proposed estimators by checking this assumption more carefully or by extending it to a more general assumptions like one considered in the Section 4 of Matthya and Beirlant (2003) taking the second order effect into consideration. These need to be checked carefully both in theoretical aspects and empirical performances of such extended assumptions to the present estimators with respect to the bias. This in turn would also help us to get theoretical framework for a data-driven choice of the tuning parameters. We hope to pursue these generalizations of the proposed estimators in our subsequent research.

6. Conclusion

The present paper considers the problem of estimating the tail index under contaminated samples and proposes a set of robust estimators based on the density power divergence and an exponential model approximation to the true data that works equally well in all the three types of tail. Thus, it needs no prior information on the type of tail and ensure the researchers to produce a “good” estimator of it compared to the existing ones, even if there is some outlying erroneous observations mixed with the sample at hand. In this present paper we have given more emphasis on this robustness aspect of the proposed estimators rather than its asymptotic properties and illustrated the success through the theoretical analysis based on the influence function and empirical simulation of different kind of contaminated samples. However, we have provided some indication on its asymptotic efficiencies under different tail-types. Based on the findings from the extensive simulation, we have also made an empirical suggestion on the choice of tuning parameters so that any applied researcher can use the proposed estimator for the real life data on the respective field. Therefore, this paper proposes a new robust estimator of the tail index for all three tail-types and justifies the proposal through various theoretical and empirical observations.

References

- [1] Basu, A., Harris, I. R., Hjort, N. L. and Jones, M. C. (1998). Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, **85**, 549–559.
- [2] Beirlant, J., Dierckx, G., Goegebeur, Y. and Matthys, G. (1999). Tail index estimation and an exponential regression model. *Extremes*, **2**(2), 177–200.
- [3] Dekkers, A. L. M., Einmahl, J. H. J. and de Haan, L. (1989). A moment estimator for the index of an extreme value distribution. *Ann. Statist.*, **17**, 1833–1855.
- [4] Ghosh, A. and Basu, A. (2013). Robust Estimation for Independent Non-Homogeneous Observations using Density Power Divergence with Applications to Linear Regression. *Electronic Journal of statistics*, **7**, 2420–2456.
- [5] Gnedenko, B. V. (1943). Sur la distribution limite du terme maximum d’une série aléatoire. *Ann. Math.*, **44**, 423–453.
- [6] Goegebeur, Y., Guillou, A. and Rietsch T. (2014). Robust conditional Weibull-type estimation. *Ann. Inst. of Statist. Math.*, 1–36.
- [7] de Haan, L. (1970). On regular variation and its application to the weak convergence of sample extremes. *Math. centre Tract*, **32**, Amsterdam.
- [8] Hill, B. M. (1975). A simple general approach to inference about the tail of a distribution. *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 1163–1174.
- [9] Hosking, J. R. M. and Wallis, J. R. (1987). Parameter and quantile estimation for the generalized Pareto distribution. *Technometrics*, **29**, 339–349.
- [10] Kim, M. and Lee, S. (2008). Estimation of a tail index based on minimum density power divergence. *Journal of multivariate Analysis*, **99**, 2453–2471.
- [11] Marazzi, A. and Yohai, V. (2004). Adaptively truncated maximum likelihood regression with asymmetric errors. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **122**, 271–291.
- [12] Matthys, G. and Beirlant, J. (2003). Estimating the extreme value index and high quantiles with exponential regression models. *Statistica Sinica*, **13**, 853–880.
- [13] Pickands III, J. (1975). Statistical inference using extreme order statistics. *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 119–131.
- [14] Smith, R. L. (1987). Estimating tails of probability distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, **15**, 1174–1207.
- [15] Vandewalle, B., Beirlant, J. and Hubert, M. (2004). A robust estimator of the tail index based on an exponential regression model. In *Theory and Applications of Recent Robust Methods*, Editors M. Hubert, G. Pison, A. Struyf, and S. van Aelst. 367–376. Basel: Birkhauser.
- [16] Vandewalle, B., Beirlant, J., Christmann, A. and Hubert, M. (2007). A robust estimator for the tail index of Pareto-type distributions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **51**(12), 6252–6268.

Appendix A. Assumptions (A1)–(A7) of Ghosh and Basu (2013) under the Assumed Exponential Regression Model

We have assume the set-up of an exponential regression model, where the random variables $W_1, \dots, W_n, \dots$ are independent but for each j , W_j follows an exponential distribution with mean $\theta_j = \frac{\gamma}{1 - (\frac{\gamma}{k+1})^\gamma}$. In this paper we have approximated the distribution of the transformed variable Y_j , as defined in Section 2, by the distribution of W_j for each $j = 1, \dots, k - 1$. Now we will present a brief argument to show that the assumptions (A1)–(A7) of Ghosh and Basu (2013) required for asymptotic consistency and normality of the MDPDE holds under the present set-up of exponential regression model.

First note that the assumption (A1)–(A3) and (A5) holds directly by the form of exponential distribution. Next, as shown in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the matrix $J^{(i)}$ as per the notation of Ghosh and Basu (2013) is a positive scalar given by

$$J^{(i)} = \frac{(1 + \alpha^2)}{(1 + \alpha)^3} \tilde{J} \left(\frac{i}{k+1} \right) \theta_i^{\alpha-2}.$$

So, the matrix Ψ_n is in fact a positive scalar with $\lambda_0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_n = a_\gamma > 0$; this implies that (A4) also holds. Finally we need to prove three limiting statements of assumptions (A6) and (A7) of Ghosh and Basu (2013). We only present the proof of first one, namely (considering that we are here dealing with scalar parameter γ)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k > 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E [|\nabla_g V_i(W_i; \theta)| I(|\nabla_g V_i(W_i; \theta)| > N)] \right\} = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Here ∇_g represents the derivative with respect to our parameter of interest γ . The proof of others are similar and hence omitted.

To prove (A.1), note that under this present model, we have for each i ,

$$\nabla_g V_i(W_i; \theta) = C_i \left[\frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^2} + \left(\frac{W_i}{\theta_i} - 1 \right) e^{-\frac{\alpha W_i}{\theta_i}} \right] = C_i \psi \left(\frac{W_i}{\theta_i} \right),$$

where $C_i = (1+\alpha) \tilde{J}_\alpha \left(\frac{i}{k+1} \right) \theta_i$ and $\psi(w) = \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^2} + (w-1)e^{-\alpha w}$. However, letting $W_i^* = \frac{W_i}{\theta_i}$, we get that $W_1^*, \dots, W_{k-1}^*$ are independent and identically distributed observations from standard exponential distribution with mean 1. So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E [|\nabla_g V_i(W_i; \theta)| I(|\nabla_g V_i(W_i; \theta)| > N)] \\ &= \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E \left[|C_i| \left| \psi \left(\frac{W_i}{\theta_i} \right) \right| I(|C_i| \left| \psi \left(\frac{W_i}{\theta_i} \right) \right| > N) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |C_i| E \left[\left| \psi(W_i^*) \right| I(|\psi(W_i^*)| > \frac{N}{\max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |C_i|}) \right] \\ &= E \left[\left| \psi(W_1^*) \right| I(|\psi(W_1^*)| > \frac{N}{\max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |C_i|}) \right] \left(\frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |C_i| \right). \end{aligned}$$

However, it is easy to check that both the terms $\left(\frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |C_i| \right)$ and $(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |C_i|)$ are bounded as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\left| \psi_1(W_1^*) \right| I(|\psi_1(W_1^*)| > \frac{N}{\max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} |C_i|}) \right] = 0,$$

and hence (A.1) holds.

Appendix B. Some Comments on the Estimator Proposed by Vandewalle et al. (2004)

Vandewalle et al. (2004) presented a interesting and practically important footstep in statistics by justifying the necessity of combining two apparently contradictory theory of extreme value statistics and robust statistics. They proposed a robust estimator based on a similar exponential regression model as considered here for the Pareto-Type tails

($\gamma > 0$). They have used the robust regression method proposed by Marazzi and Yohai (2004) and the exponential regression model developed in Beirlant et al. (1999) given by

$$Y_j \sim_d \left(\gamma + b_{n,k} \left(\frac{\gamma}{k+1} \right)^{-\rho} \right) g_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where g_j are independent and identically distributed standard exponential random variables. The proposed estimator was examined through a interesting real data example its robustness was argued clearly.

While developing the robust estimator, Vandewalle et al. (2004) transformed the above model into a liner form given by Equation (3.1) of their paper, which reads

$$Y_j \sim_d \gamma + b_{n,k} \left(\frac{\gamma}{k+1} \right)^{-\rho} + \gamma e_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (\text{B.2})$$


where $e_j = g_j - 1$. Here comes our first little doubts by noting that the RHS of the Equations (B.1) and (B.2) are not equal; the closest form to the second that equals the first is

$$\gamma + b_{n,k} \left(\frac{\gamma}{k+1} \right)^{-\rho} g_j + \gamma e_j.$$


So, it needs to be clarified the reason of dropping g_j from the second term. After assuming the linearized form (B.2), they have re-parametrize it as

$$Y_j = \theta_1 + \theta_2 t_j + \sigma e_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $t_j = \left(\frac{\gamma}{k+1} \right)^{-\rho}$, $\theta_1 = \gamma$, $\theta_2 = b_{n,k}$ and $\sigma = \gamma$. Then, for the case $\gamma > 0$, they have used the robust regression method proposed by Marazzi and Yohai (2004) to estimate the parameters (θ_1 , θ_2 , σ). The regression method used there has high breakdown and efficiency for usual regression set-up that they have noted for proposing the robust estimator of γ ; However, the approach is computationally complicated. Moreover, under the transformed set-up (B.3) it is to be noted that $\theta_1 = \sigma$; this constraint need to be taken care of while solving for the estimator numerically and may have potential effect on the properties of the resulting estimator. This needs to be examined extensively through simulation or theoretical results, that was missing from the work of Vandewalle et al. (2004). They have also noted similar limitation of the work and made a comment in the “conclusion” that they would consider this issues in their future work. Considering all this doubts, we have decided not to consider this proposal in our simulation studies.




(a) 5% contamination




(b) 15% contamination

Figure 10: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M1) having $\nu = 2$ with contamination by the same model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




(a) 5% contamination




(b) 15% contamination

Figure 11: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M3) having $\gamma = 0.5$ with contamination by the same model (M3) having $\gamma = 3$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




(a) 5% contamination




(b) 15% contamination

Figure 12: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M2) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ with contamination by the same model (M2) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 0.25, 1)$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].



(a) 5% contamination



(b) 15% contamination

Figure 13: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thick lines) and $\hat{\gamma}_{KL,k}^{(\alpha)}$ (thin lines) for model (M1) having $\nu = 2$ with contamination by the model (M3) having $\gamma = 3$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 14: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M4) with contamination by the model (M5) both having $\gamma = 0$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 15: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M4) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination by the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ ($\gamma = 3$) [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 16: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination by the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ ($\gamma = 3$) [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 17: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ with contamination by the model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 18: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ with contamination by the model (M5) having $\gamma = 0$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 19: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M6) having $\gamma = -1$ with contamination by the model (M1) having $\nu = 1/3$ ($\gamma = 3$) [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].




Figure 20: The empirical bias and MSE of the estimators $\hat{\gamma}_{ER,k}^{(\alpha)}$ for model (M7) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (1, 1, 1)$ with contamination by the model (M2) having $(\beta, \tau, \lambda) = (4, 0.25, 1)$ [Solid line: $\alpha = 0$, Dotted line: $\alpha = 0.3$, Dashed-dotted line: $\alpha = 0.5$, Dashed line: $\alpha = 1$].